

Illinois U Library

MAY 9, 1949

558TH BROADCAST

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



U. S. Pat. Off.

Should We Help To Rearm Western Europe?

Moderator, **GEORGE V. DENNY, Jr.**

Speakers

ELY CULBERTSON

JOHN A. BLATNIK

HERBERT LEWIS

WALTER DURANTY

(See also page 13)

COMING

May 10, 1949

**Should Minority Groups Exercise Censorship
Over Books and Films?**

Published by **THE TOWN HALL, Inc.**, New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 15, NUMBER 1 **U.S. OF I.** \$1.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY

LIBRARY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 3:

"Should We Help To Rearm Western Europe?"

Mr. DENNY.....	3
Mr. CULBERTSON.....	4
Mr. DURANTY.....	6
Mr. LEWIS.....	8
Congressman BLATNIK.....	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	13
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!.....	17



THE BROADCAST OF MAY 10:

"Should Minority Groups Exercise Censorship Over Books and Films?"



The Broadcast of May 3, 1949, originated in Duluth Armory, Duluth, Minnesota, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MAY 3, 1949

VOL. 15, No. 1

Should We Help To Rearm Western Europe?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Tonight we are happy to be the guests of the Women's Institute of Duluth, which, for the past ten years, has been bringing outstanding cultural and educational events to the city of Duluth. The Women's Institute and its parent—the *Duluth News Tribune and Herald*—our local sponsor, Freimuth and Company, and Station WDWM have given your Town Meeting a most cordial welcome here.

Tonight's discussion, as we've indicated, is a continuation of our meeting two weeks ago, when we discussed the question, "Should the Senate Ratify the Atlantic Pact?" Last week, Secretary Acheson recommended to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that we help arm Western Europe under the terms of the Pact to the extent of approximately \$1,130,000—about 20 per cent of which would represent a transfer of pres-

ent surplus equipment now owned by our armed forces.

Since you, the American people, have the greatest possible stake in the solution of this question, we urge you to hear both sides, then make up your own minds and let your representatives in Congress know what you think.

We're to hear first from a man who has been a lifelong student of world problems since his graduation from the School of Science and Politics in Paris. One of our most versatile public figures is Ely Culbertson, a sixth generation American on his father's side, and grandson of a Cossack general on his mother's side.

Although he won fame and fortune in the bridge world, since 1940 Mr. Culbertson has been devoting practically his entire time to the cause of world peace, and has written several books in this field. He's now Chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the United Nations Reform. Well, Ely Culbertson, should we help to

rearm Western Europe? Mr. Culbertson. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Culbertson:

We should help to rearm Western Europe because we are the only power in the world today that can save the remaining free nations of Europe and Asia from a cruel conquest by the Communist Eurasian Empire.

If we forsake them now, to save a few billion dollars or to appease the Lenin-Stalin clique, our turn will come next and we shall pay through the tears of generations of Americans.

We must help to rearm Western Europe now because, as I speak to you here, twelve ideological fanatics are straining the vast resources of Soviet Russia to complete the building of their atomic plant. We Americans still hold the monopoly on the atomic bombs—enough of them, so that in a few days of war we could force Communist Russia to peace.

To them, we made the most generous offer in history—offering to renounce this irresistible weapon and surrender it to international control if only the Moscow rulers would agree to do likewise.

They refused! Why? Because they preferred instead to build their own atomic bomb, in confident expectation that the Americans would be naive enough to let them do so. And so far we are letting them get away with murder.

Within about two years, Stalin

and his stooges will probably have in their possession enough atomic bombs to terrify the European nations into submission, enough to threaten the existence of scores of American cities.

That is why I would go much further than merely helping to rearm Europe. I would bring a showdown with Moscow rulers now, and I would bring that showdown by force, if necessary, and, yes, even by our atomic force.

Understand me well, radio listeners, I do not advocate and I have never advocated a power politics war against Soviet Russia. I am opposed to a preventive war against Russia just as emphatically as I am opposed to appeasement of its Communist rulers.

I consider it a crime against humanity to kill a single Russian child, or woman, or man, so long as there is another way out. There is a far more noble and a more practical method of bringing the Moscow international gangsters to their knees than the method of a preventive war. It is the kind of a method that good citizens use in any community when confronted with an arrogant and a lawless gang.

We do not organize another gang to shoot up the first gang—we go to law, and if law is not good enough, we make a better law, and if the court is corrupt we get a better court.

I feel that our State Department missed, again, a marvelous opportunity in not building some

thing far better than the Atlantic Pact. It is our national misfortune that we still have in the State Department too many men of little vision, too many men who tremble in their boots every time Stalin frowns, too many five o'clock fighters for world peace.

Once on the Town Meeting of the Air, I said about our Secretary Byrnes' trip to Moscow that, while the State Department fiddles, Byrnes roams. (*Applause.*) Well, now the State Department just fiddles.

Here is how I would have played the game with Stalin if I were in Secretary Acheson's boots, even though his boots are about size 3.

First, I would have provided to extend the Atlantic Pact into a world pact, open to all peaceful nations — not a Utopian world state, but simply something like a revised United Nations. There would be a world security council operating without a veto by aggressors, a world court, and an international police force, recruited exclusively from citizens of smaller nations and backed up by the national armed forces of larger nations.

Having done all this, the world authority would have called upon Russia, saying something like this: "We do not like your Communist state and we are determined to have peace in the world. Therefore, go behind your Curzon Line, which is your legal frontier, and we will guarantee you against any aggression. We are also deter-

mined that no state or clique in control of any state may engage in an armament race, especially with atomic bombs.

"Therefore, we have decided that the Soviet Government shall have a fair quota of production of heavy armament equal to the reduced American quota, and that the atomic energy shall be controlled and inspected internationally.

"You have one week to think it over. If you join us, the world will welcome you with joy. We might even lend you a few billion dollars, but if you keep on building atomic bombs, with the evident intention of destroying our cities, then after one week you would have to evacuate your chief cities, because we are determined to stop you by force. Answer promptly, Stalin, don't waste your time by trying to bluff us again. We know what we can do, and we also know what you cannot do, as yet. That is all." (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Ely Culbertson. Well, sharp differences of opinion make good town meetings. Our next speaker disagrees sharply with Ely Culbertson. He's one of the outstanding authorities on Soviet Russia, having been *New York Times* correspondent in Moscow for more than 20 years. Walter Duranty was born in Liverpool, England, graduated from Cambridge University with highest honors, made extensive travel

throughout Europe before undertaking his newspaper career. Mr. Duranty is the author of several books, the most recent being *Stalin and Company*, which is largely an account of the Politburo, the men who run Russia. Walter Duranty, welcome back to Town Meeting. (Applause.)

Mr. Duranty:

Mr. Culbertson seems convinced that the Russians are feverishly preparing for war, that they are simply waiting until they have the atomic bomb, and ready to use it. I question that as a fact.

Furthermore, Mr. Culbertson suggests that we should send ultimatums to Russia. He actually named the date, a period of one week, which should be addressed to Russia. Now that seems to me to be somewhat outside the discussion we are having tonight.

In addition to that, of course, Mr. Culbertson wanted to reform the Atlantic Pact, and I don't doubt that he'd be quite prepared to reform the United Nations, too. But really, that is not, as I said before, entirely within our evening range.

The question we are discussing now is whether or not this country should help to rearm Europe, and not whether the Atlantic Pact or the United Nations should be reformed.

The first thing I'd like to ask is why rearm Europe any more? Already, most European countries, notably England, are spending

more money than they can afford on rearmament. Instead of increasing their armament, we should try to find means of diminishing it. That's to say of helping Europe to disarm. That's what I'd like to see.

You see, we must get our thinking clear. Against what is Europe to be rearmed? Well, you'd say, in general terms, against the Red Peril. But what does that mean? Does it mean invasion by the Red Army, or internal trouble?

I say the two things are entirely different. One's a military problem—that is, war. The other is a political-economic problem—that is, revolution.

To rearm Europe for war would cost far more than a billion dollars, if it can be done at all, and it would take a very long time.

I know people have talked about equipping 70 divisions of European troops as the first line defense against the Russians, to hold them until the American troops can come over. But don't forget that Europe is not only Western Europe. There is also the question of Germany. Are we going to rearm Germany, too?

If one considers the facts of the case, we must see that Russia's in no condition to fight a major war. Russia's losses in manpower and material have been terrific. If you can imagine that the whole of the United States east of the Mississippi had been devastated, seven or eight million soldiers killed, fifteen or twenty million civilian

killed—why reconstruction alone will demand all Russia's energies for a long time.

Then think, too, about the superiority of American industrial production and all the materials needed for war, in steel, coal, iron, and other metals—far superior—four or five times. Then, of course, America's technical capacity — there's practically no comparison.

It's true there may have been a time when the Russians thought they could bluff the United States. The Atlantic Pact has made it quite clear to Russia that this country means business. Right now they are showing signs of settling the Berlin blockade, which proves the Russians won't act rashly if they understand that the United States won't stand for any more nonsense.

The Russians don't want war; they can't afford it. We simply want to show them, and we have shown them, that any aggressive action on their part will be met by armed resistance.

It is by peaceful action that the Red Peril can best be averted. The real threat of the Red Peril is not invasion, of course, but the danger of revolution. The spread of Communism in the West has been due to economic ruin and social degeneration.

Why, a year ago, it almost looked as if France and Italy might go Red because of economic distress. The disorganization of transport, business, agriculture, and industry caused by

the war—that's the real cause of revolution.

No one can deny that France and Italy were saved to a great extent by the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan helped Europe to help itself to get on its own feet, to remove the poverty and the misery of the masses which inclined them to listen to the Bolshevik agitators.

It was economic and financial aid which saved Europe and not new divisions and guns and tanks. What's more, Europe is exhausted and can't fight another war.

We couldn't even rely upon these armies. We wouldn't know whether they might not use their fresh strength for colonial adventures—the French, in Indo-China; the Dutch, in Indonesia.

You see, after all, the question is finally and basically a financial problem. The amount of money to be spent in helping Europe is limited. This money can be well spent and has been well spent in civil, that is, economic aid, rather than in military aid. To build roads and railroads and bridges, locomotives, freight cars, and ships; to help with grain and agricultural machinery and cattle; to give financial help, to fight inflation—that's where the cause of disintegration and the social revolution lies.

All these things have been done by the Marshall Plan and they have helped to pull Europe around. Conditions are much more stable and if we help or push

Europe into further rearmament, on which, as I say, they are already spending money also, that will hinder and delay and even halt economic improvement.

You've only to read the speeches of Sir Stafford Cripps to realize that. We have already found the way to win the peace. Why risk losing it by wasting money preparing for war which neither Europe nor the Russians can afford to fight nor want to fight? (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Walter Duranty. Our next speaker is also a journalist, a native of Minnesota, who began his newspaper career as a student at the University of Minnesota. Herbert Lewis has been a member of the editorial staff of the *St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch* since 1921 and became chief editorial writer in 1924. We're happy to have him as a speaker. Mr. Herbert Lewis. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lewis: *

Mr. Duranty wants to place sole reliance on the Marshall Plan against aggression by Communist Russia. The Marshall Plan deals only with economic defense. Mr. Duranty wishes us to stand only on one leg. We also must have military defense against the largest land force in the world today, the Red Army.

* Because of station difficulties, much of Mr. Lewis' speech was not heard over the air.

The basic reason why we should help Western Europe to rearm, Mr. Duranty, is the same as that which led us to help Greece and Turkey. If we had not given military help to Greece and Turkey, both of them would be behind the Iron Curtain today.

If we do not help the people of Western Europe the same way they will be smashed or, like Czechoslovakia, enslaved. We also have in their case the North Atlantic Pact which says that an attack on any member is the same as an attack on all—that includes us. We would be obligated to go over and try to liberate those people. But we would be liberating corpses and ruins.

What happened to France and others in the last war is only a faint preview of what their fate would be if they fell even temporarily into the hands of the Red Army and the secret police. Our friends abroad ask something better than this, and I, for one, agree. They ask that they be helped so that they can defend themselves and it is certainly to our advantage and security to see that they are able to do so.

If the Pact does not mean this it means nothing. In fact, the Pact is very clear. It says that each nation is obligated to help itself and to help other members to prepare to resist aggression singly and jointly. How much they need and how much we should send are separate questions. The Pact leaves that up to our best judgment.

ment and to theirs, but the obligation is clear.

What the State Department is proposing right now is roughly \$1,130,000,000 of which a part will be in the form of existing war surplus. I believe that any sum settled upon by Congress, however, should not be mingled with our own budget here at home. It should be kept clear of confusion so that all may know where the one leaves off and the other begins.

I do not see any need to cut into our military appropriations to carry out this new foreign program. Neither is there any grave dollars and cents difficulty involved.

Since our budget estimates for 1950 were made, there has been a decline of prices. It now appears that Congress can proceed with all legitimate needs of the Government, and with this program, too, without the over-all budget getting out of line very much, if at all.

For example, it is probable that the Marshall Plan assistance for the next year can be cut about 10 per cent in view of the lower prices, without really reducing that vital program. The saving would be about \$500,000,000. But, in any event, having in mind the existing recession, dangers of inflation through government spending have lost their power to alarm. The problem is actually now one on the other side.

One point needs to be kept in

mind. I know that there have been some who have thought that the rearming of Western Europe may lead to an excessive increase of militaristic preparedness. They say too much is going for arms—not enough into the economic recovery of Europe.

It must be understood that we are being asked to supply our friends abroad with such a small proportion of their defense needs which they are not able to supply themselves—with types of equipment and a small amount of materials that are available here and not there.

We are not going to send them atomic bombs or any secret weapons. What they require from us are modern defense weapons like anti-tank guns. With such equipment, they can build their existing defense establishment into balanced forces for resisting attack.

I want to emphasize that point. The schedules of equipment we are talking about are based on the present defense forces of the Western countries as set forth in their existing—that is, their 1950—budget.

The importance of doing this is very great. What we require of the nations in the front line of Europe, who have entered into this agreement for their and our security, is both the ability and the will to resist, if attacked.

Some of these nations, like Britain and Norway, now have this will to resist to a high degree; France and Italy to a lesser de-

gree. But the will to resist comes with confidence in one's ability to resist.

If we can help these nations know that they can stand up successfully in the face of attack, they will resist. That in itself would be a tremendous factor for victory, and for defeat of aggression if the need were to arise.

But I believe that the more this will and ability to resist grows, the less will be the danger that such aggression will ever occur.

Through the Pact, we are saying that free nations will not be picked off one by one. Through the arms program, we are showing that any attempt in that direction will lead to the appalling and stupendous risk of general and real war.

Because I believe the Soviet Government does not want to assume those risks, I believe that this program and Pact will be a tremendous factor in averting a shooting war. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Congressional business keeps our next speaker in Washington, but he will participate just as if he were here with us. Congressman John A. Blatnik is also a native of Minnesota, who takes the opposite view from Mr. Lewis on tonight's question.

Congressman Blatnik started his career as a public school teacher and administrator, but was soon elected to the Minnesota

State Senate. In 1946, he was elected to our national Congress, and was reelected again last November. Congressman Blatnik has a distinguished service record in World War II, and we're happy to welcome him to Town Meeting. Congressman John A. Blatnik of Minnesota, speaking to us from Washington. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Blatnik:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. Mr. Culbertson seems to feel that war is inevitable unless the world accepts his blueprint of two worlds. Mr. Lewis suggests—and I gather this, although we missed almost half of Mr. Lewis' report due to a break in the line—but I gather that he asks us to continue the policy of containment which we began in Greece, and which was our former policy in China.

I, like Mr. Duranty, seriously question the reasoning of both of these gentlemen.

To the question "Should We Rearm Western Europe?" I say emphatically, "No." Why? Because rearming Europe is economically unsound, politically unwise and militarily impractical.

I am prepared to support any workable plan to bolster our national defense, to defend democracy, and to promote world peace. Rearming Europe, I am convinced will contribute to none of these objectives.

Did we rebuild Germany after World War I to halt communism and to protect Wall Street invest-

ments? Paid propagandists with bleeding hearts for poor misunderstood Germany told us that that nation's revival was necessary for peace and European recovery. So we halted reparations and returned the Ruhr to the cartelists—to the very men who were to finance and engineer Hitler's rise to power.

Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations was repudiated. Germany secretly rearmed. Big business leaders from America praised Hitler. The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo anti-communist axis was born.

Did this stop communism? It did not. It led only to World War II.

Today's headlines read like history being repeated. "Propaganda to rebuild Germany." "Armament programs to halt communism." "Power politics." "United Nations wavers."

Will the new anti-communist axis built around reformed Nazis, Japanese industrialists, Greek royalists, and, perhaps, eventually, Franco's Spain be any more successful or will American dollars for European rearmament lead only toward a third world war?

It is proposed that we equip from 40 to 70 European divisions. In five years, this will cost us at least \$16,000,000,000. While Americans are willing to make all necessary sacrifices for democracy and peace, this State Department program is, in my opinion, a rat-kill operation which will only defeat itself.

Considering its effects upon our country's economy, these billions, added to our present \$21,000,000,000 cold war budget, will be subtracted from the funds needed for the Fair Deal program. Instead of building schools, homes, hospitals, and highways, our tax dollars will go for European armament.

We cannot have social welfare programs at home while financing vast rearmament programs abroad.

And how will our arms program affect Europe's millions? It will retard the economic reconstruction of the very nations we propose to help. By 1952, we will have poured more than 17 billion dollars in ECA funds into Western Europe. And even then, our ECA experts tell us today the recovery program will be only half completed.

The armament burden in Europe is already too heavy. Britain received one billion in ECA dollars last year, and spent three times that amount for arms. France accepted \$875,000,000 from ECA the same year, and spent over eight billion dollars for guns and bombers.

Budgets of other North Atlantic Pact countries tell a similar story. In short, our ECA dollars appropriated to raise European living standards are, to some extent, even now being spent for guns.

The echo is heard across the world—in Indonesia and Indo-China.

In the meantime, European eco-

conomic recovery lags, social unrest increases, and communism gains new followers. The major fallacy of this whole rearmament scheme is the notion that Russia is a real threat to the status quo in Europe. This was very well pointed out by my colleague, Mr. Duranty, and I agree that this is not so.

The threat is political and ideological, and not military. It is internal and not external. You cannot fight ideas and political ideologies with guns. Look at China; look at Greece. There the suppressed Wiedeman report revealed that the Truman doctrine has failed militarily and economically. Fire and sword cannot silence all popular demands for agrarian reform, mass education, and the end of exploitation.

The way to fight ideas is with new and better ones and with constructive programs for economic health and social justice.

Assuming for the sake of argument that Russia did attack, then the Red Army would in a few weeks capture the weapons we had furnished to Western Europe. Look at what has happened in China and is happening today.

So I oppose arms for Europe because it represents one more milestone on the road to war. It is a blow at the United Nations because it cements the present two-world division and encourages an all-out armament race.

Even as plans for European rearmament go ahead, the press re-

ports tonight the Big Four talks in Germany, and perhaps a general European settlement may begin shortly. Let us exploit this lull in the cold war for peace instead of rearming Europe for war.

Today, the world prays for a just, honorable, and lasting peace. In seeking this goal, there can be no substitute for statesmanship. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Blatnik. Well, gentlemen, this seems to call for a little discussion up here around the microphone before we take the questions from this splendid audience here in Duluth, so how about Mr. Culbertson starting off?

Mr. Culbertson: Well, I just want to ask one question of Congressman Blatnik. Congressman Blatnik, you draw a clever parallel between the old anti-Comintern alliance of Hitler-Mussolini-Hirohito, and the new anti-Comintern alliance. You claim to say that they all had failed and led to World War II, and that the new, therefore, will also lead to World War III.

Now I ask you, isn't it more correct to say that had the European and American democracies, instead of appeasing the totalitarian Hitler, united against him, there would have been no World War I and, in the same way, if the democracies of the world really unite now against the totalitarian Stalin, there would be no World War III? (*Applause.*)

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

ELY CULBERTSON—Famous for the Culbertson System of bridge rules, Ely Culbertson has also become well known for his plans for world peace. Born in Rumania in 1891, he was the son of a Scottish-American father (an American citizen) and a Cossack mother.

His youth in Russia not only included the pleasures of a wealthy playboy, but imprisonment in a czarist prison, and revolutionary activities. Sent to America, he was enrolled at Yale but he soon became bored and dropped out to see more of American life. After roaming the world for several years, he returned to Europe where he attended L'Ecole des Sciences Economiques et Politiques in Paris, and later the University of Geneva. It was in Geneva that he first learned the game of auction bridge which was later to bring him not only fame, but also fortune.

Mr. Culbertson's extremely full and adventurous life can be read in his autobiography, *The Strange Lives of One Man* (1940). His other books include many on the subject of bridge. His *Blue Book of Contract Bridge* is considered, with the exception of the Bible, the all-time nonfiction best seller. He is the editor of *Bridge World Magazine*, president of The Bridge World, Inc., the Kem Playing Card Company, and Culbertson National Studios, New York.

Always, Mr. Culbertson has considered his bridge interests only as a hobby and as a means of making money. During the war he devoted much thought to postwar planning. His plans are given in *Summary of the World Federation Plan*, *The World Federation Plan*, and *Total Peace*. His most recent book, *Must We Fight Russia?* is being widely read.

At present, he is chairman of the Citizens Committee for the United Nations Reform.

HERBERT LEFKOVITZ LEWIS—Born in Austin, Minnesota, in 1898, Mr. Lewis has his A.B. and A.M. degrees from the University of Minnesota. For one year he was a reporter on the *Marshall* (Minn.) *News Messenger*. Then he went to the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* and *Dispatch* where he has been reporter,

editorial writer, editorial director, acting managing editor, radio commentator, and, now, editor.

During World War I, he served as a private in the U. S. Army. In 1930, he was awarded the Harris political science prize.

JOHN A. BLATNIK—Born in Chisholm, Minnesota, in 1911, Congressman Blatnik has a B.E. cum laude from Winona (Minn.) State Teachers College. He has also studied at the University of Chicago and at the University of Minnesota. After teaching school for a year, he became educational adviser for the Civilian Conservation Corps in Superior National Forest, Minnesota, in 1935. In 1937, he went back to school teaching as a chemistry instructor in Chisholm High School. From 1939 to 1941, he was assistant to the St. Louis County Superintendent of Schools.

From 1941 to 1946, Congressman Blatnik was a member of the Minnesota State Senate. He was then elected to the 80th Congress of the United States as Democratic member from the Eighth Minnesota District. He is member of the House Public Works Committee and the House Steering Committee.

During World War II, Congressman Blatnik served in the Army Air Corps Intelligence and the Office of Strategic Services.

WALTER DURANTY—Writer, foreign correspondent, and lecturer, Walter Duranty was born in Liverpool, England, in 1885. He was graduated with classical honors from Cambridge in 1906. From 1913 to 1939, Mr. Duranty was a foreign correspondent for the *New York Times*. During this period he was with the French Armies in 1917-18. He was a resident of Russia and was head of the Moscow bureau of the *Times*, from 1921 to 1934. From 1934 to 1939 he was a roving correspondent in Russia. From 1939 to 1941 he was a correspondent in Europe, Russia, and Japan.

Mr. Duranty's books include *I Write As I Please*; *One Life, One Kopek*; *The Kremlin and the People*; *Search for a Key*; *U. S. S. R.*; *Return to the Vineyard* (with Mary Loos); and a new book, *Stalin and Company*.

Congressman Blatnik: Mr. Culbertson, I certainly say "no" to your question. I think the conditions are entirely different. I should like to quote from John

Foster Dulles, the spokesman of foreign policy—

Mr. Culbertson: Not mine!

Congressman Blatnik: Just a minute. —who came back and

made this statement: "I do not know of any responsible high official, military or civilian in this Government or any other government, who believes that the Soviet state now plans conquest by open military aggression." This point was emphasized by General Bedell Smith, former Ambassador, just returned, and the conditions are entirely different.

At the time of Hitler's rise and expansion, there was no question what his intentions were.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman. Mr. Lewis has a comment there.

Mr. Lewis. Of course, I'd like to keep them in that state of mind, providing they actually are not planning aggressive war. But, Mr. Duranty, you say that if we would only show Russia that we mean business, then they will behave. I agree; at least, I hope that that's true. Then why do you oppose showing them by the most obvious means available to us, that of really arming our friends? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Duranty: I think the Atlantic Pact already has shown Russia the danger of aggression, has shown Russia that this country will resist aggression with all its force. That is to say with all its industrial and military might, with its air power, and last, but not least, with the atomic bomb. But this idea of helping our friends—helping them how? To give them two or three more divisions, or a few more tanks or guns, which they

are really in no position to use? No one really expects Europe to be able to defend itself against Russia. What we're talking of is how to prevent war, not how to act in a war.

Now I say that Mr. Culbertson is perfectly frank. He comes straight out and says: Give them an ultimatum and tell them that we won't have any war and they'd better rearm and retire behind the Curzon Line.

On the other hand, Mr. Lewis puts it: We should help them to rearm themselves because then maybe they'll be able to resist.

We all know that if there were a war, certainly Europe could not defend itself. I say that the danger is ideological, internal, just as Mr. Blatnik said, and that what we want to do is to help Europe get on its economic feet. That will cut the ground from under all communist propaganda everywhere. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Blatnik: Mr. Denny, may I follow up Mr. Duranty with a question for Mr. Culbertson?

Mr. Denny: Yes, he's quite ready.

Congressman Blatnik: He is so convinced that Russia is bent on a world-wide program of aggression and conquest, I ask Mr. Culbertson, what's holding Russia back now?

Mr. Culbertson: She has no atomic bomb. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now,

Mr. Culbertson, you had a question.

Mr. Culbertson: Well, I want to ask Mr. Duranty a question. In the first place, I want to comment briefly that it isn't a question of communist ideology. We're not afraid of that. We are afraid of communist bombs.

The question I want to ask him is this: Why does he assume, the same as the Congressman, that the Russian Red Army will sweep all over Europe in a few days? Why does Mr. Duranty assume that 40, 50, or 70 divisions would not be enough to resist the invincible Russian army? Doesn't he reflect subconsciously, I think, the communist propaganda on the invincibility of the Red Army? I say it's a myth. Do you think so, Mr. Duranty?

Mr. Duranty: I certainly don't think the Red Army's invincible. I don't believe it would sweep across Europe. I devoted at least a quarter of my statement to saying the reasons why Russia could not fight and would not fight at any time within the next ten or fifteen years.

I don't agree with Mr. Culbertson. I'd like to ask him why is he so certain, first, that the Russians haven't got the bomb now and equally certain they will have it in two or three years? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Culbertson: If they've got the bomb now, I have pity on Mr. Duranty and everybody else.

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Lewis has a comment.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to ask both the Congressman and Mr. Duranty on what they base their confidence in the good intentions—the pacifism, if you will—of the Russian Government, when, by word and by deed, by word repeated for the last thirty years at home again, and again, and again, they have proclaimed the inevitability of the conflict between them and us. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Let's start with the Congressman.

Congressman Blatnik: All right. Mr. Denny, I'll try to come in on this. I think the time has come when we need more objectivity in this whole matter. Although many of us here have been led to believe that Russia is bent and determined on world-wide aggression and conquest, is it not possible that there are many Russians, the Russian people, who believe that we are bent on destroying their way of life and dominating the world?

I'd like to quote here at this point a very good point made by Joseph B. Phillips in *Newsweek* for April 18. He states, "The atmosphere of tension, fear, and uncertainty is at least as great in the Soviet Union as it is here."

We are pathologically unsure of our economic future and much of it comes from fear, both conscious and subconscious, both based on good grounds and on unfounded grounds, both to the threat of

communism to our way of life, and I do feel they feel in many instances that we threaten their way of life.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you, Congressman. Now, Mr. Duranty, have you a further comment on that question?

Mr. Duranty: Well, I don't think that the Russian good will is so wonderful. What I am suggesting is that Russia is not going to do anything aggressive in the nature of war; that Russia's success in Europe a year or two ago was ideological; that they were getting great advantage in France and Italy, notably, because of prevailing distress; that the Marshall Plan helped that distress and, therefore, the Marshall Plan did good.

Now, to say that we should be weak against Europe—I never said anything of the kind, nor did I imply it. What I said was, the Atlantic Pact is a strong shield and buttress against Russian aggression. But why should we waste money for arming weak countries who cannot really defend themselves, when they can be helped economically. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Duranty. Now, we're about to take the questions from our audience here in the Armory in Duluth, but before we get to them, I'm sure that our listeners will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: Would you like a copy of tonight's program, com-

plete with questions and answers? You may have it by sending ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, and ask for this week's Town Meeting Bulletin. Please do not send stamps. Allow at least two weeks for delivery.

We wish we could share with you the many wonderful letters we are receiving from Town Meeting friends all over the country. First, we want to thank a widow in Oakland, California, who is living on \$30 a month and who sends one dollar in the name of her late husband and one in the name of her son.

Then there is Master Stephen David Cohen, age 6½, from Baltimore, Maryland, who sent his weekly allowance to help Town Meeting go around the world. Then there is Philip Francis Lee, III, of Pass Christian, Mississippi, whose father was killed in the war before he was born who asked his grandmother, Mrs. Herbert Cole, to send in his dollar, which we gratefully acknowledge.

From Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania, Mr. Arthur T. Paine sends \$5 and, after naming four members of his family, says, "The fifth dollar is for another Paine due to be born about May 1." We salute the new Paine baby and welcome the boy or girl to our Town Hall family.

If you haven't sent in your dollar, why not send it tonight? The address is Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Well, we have an audience of about 3,000 people here in the Duluth Armory and we are ready for their questions. If our speakers can't answer them, I'll refer them to my good friends, the celebrated mind-reading couple here, Lucille and Eddie Roberts, who are right here on the stage.

Let's have a question here for Mr. Culbertson. I hope you can answer it, Mr. Culbertson.

Lady: My question is for Mr. Culbertson. Airplanes can drop atom bombs on any enemy country and return home without stopping. Is not arming buffer states outmoded?

Mr. Culbertson: We're not arming buffer states with atomic bombs. We're giving them the indispensable tanks and other armaments they couldn't produce themselves. Atomic bombs alone cannot win any war.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The question over there on the other side of the hall.

Man: This is addressed to Mr. Lewis. Is it your opinion that the one and a third billion furnished for Western Europe will spell the difference between victory and defeat in case of Russian aggression?

Mr. Lewis: Obviously, it's impossible to know the answer to that question, but with equal obviousness, it will help.

Mr. Denny: I'd refer that one to Mrs. Roberts.

Man: To Congressman Blatnik.

Because of our past isolationist and disarmed experience that nearly brought disaster upon us in the last war, should we not help arm Europe against probable communist aggression, invasion, and infiltration?

Mr. Denny: Congressman Blatnik in Washington.

Congressman Blatnik: Coming in. I think I explained in my brief five-minute period here that in trying to stop communism, the problem was internal rather than external. Now our job is to rebuild Western Europe on a sound, healthy, economic basis which will make it possible for them to develop democracy in a real and true sense of the word. The threat is internal and not from any outside aggression.

I'd like to make a quote here, if I may, on a statement that I think comes to the point on this whole thesis that you simply cannot fight ideas with weapons. I quote here from the Catholic paper *Observatore Romano* in a news article of last month: "It is impossible to paralyze an idea with violence, destroy it by force, drown it in blood. She, the church, is the greatest testimony of the folly of such prejudice. The idea that wins over another is that which excels in truth. Communism is not only a political phenomenon, it is first a moral and economic motive and fact to which social injustice is made more burning."

Man: My question is directed to Walter Duranty. Did we not also smile at Germany's early efforts in aggression and then wake up when it was almost too late?

Mr. Duranty: As the Congressman pointed out, the parallel between Germany and Russia is not an exact one. What I am saying is that the Atlantic Pact has answered the risk and danger of Russian aggression which I consider a small Russian military aggression, because, as I said, Russia is in no position to fight—not to fight the United States. What I maintain is that we need to help Europe economically against the danger of infiltration. Just as again the Congressman has said, the fight's from within—the grave danger of internal Bolshevism which comes from social degeneration and economic distress.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady on the aisle.

Lady: This is addressed to Ely Culbertson. How can we be assured that these millions will not be spent on arms antiquated by atomic warfare?

Mr. Culbertson: Well, the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, testified a few days ago that he will see to it that they get the best and most modern weapons. Of course, you never can get any assurance, nowadays.

Congressman Blatnik: May I interrupt here? Will Mr. Culbertson get together with Mr. Lewis on his case? Mr. Lewis emphasized that it would be of

rather minor cost to us because we would use existing surpluses on hand over there and more or less minor items which we have here and would send over there.

Mr. Lewis: I said nothing of the kind. I said a relatively small part of the over-all cost would be in the form of surplus equipment. That surplus equipment is not of a minor character. It is very effective modern military machinery for defense, mobile equipment.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady in the aisle, please.

Lady: My question is addressed to Mr. Blatnik. If you do not approve of great expenditures for armament, what alternative would you offer for our security against what Russia actually is doing everywhere?

Congressman Blatnik: The greatest thing we can do for our security is to offer a living example of what we in our democratic frame of life here—I'm sorry for this difficulty here; I'm getting wrapped up with microphones and my earphones. But to continue, we should demonstrate to the peoples of the world how free men and women in a free society can work. We can best do that by economic help.

I would suggest that rather than spend 1.3 billion dollars on this armament program that we send a delegation of those who propose armament for Western Europe and representatives from the other 11 signatories to the Atlantic Pact to a nation such as Finland, that is

on the Baltic end of the Iron Curtain, that has made wonderful economic recovery and doesn't show any fear of aggression from Russia, and, at the southern end on the Adriatic end of the Iron Curtain, to Yugoslavia which is one of the few countries which has borne up and declared its independence and speaks back to Russia and, at the same time, in a very independent way without outside assistance, is going along with its economic recovery program.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady in the back of the hall, there.

Lady: My question is directed to Mr. Lewis. Will the economy of the United States withstand the taxation that is necessary to support rearmament since the amount of purchasing power in the hands of the people is decreasing?

Mr. Lewis: I believe that a nation with an annual product of \$250,000,000,000, an annual income of \$220,000,000,000, can stand \$1,130,000,000 for this purpose very easily and also take care of all our other legitimate needs.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you.

Congressman Blatnik: Mr. Denny, may I come in just to wind up on this?

Mr. Denny: Yes, sir.

Congressman Blatnik: I'm going to quote from Dr. Edwin Norris, economic adviser for the President, when he stated last month that heavy armament expenditures and foreign aid cannot be

increased much more without jeopardizing our entire economy. He urged that if funds are voted for Europe you must reduce the appropriation for the ECA and for U. S. defense. We are today going into deficit spending. Within the next eight or nine weeks, by June 30, which winds up this present fiscal year, we shall be around a billion dollars in the red. If the present expenditures program is to go on and the present tax receipts continue as they are now coming in, we shall be anywhere from five to seven billion dollars in the red a year from this June 30. That is a serious situation, when we have such drastic deficit spending in these inflationary times.

Mr. Denny: All right, thank you, Congressman. The young lady here.

Lady: I have a question for Mr. Culbertson. Have we a moral right to talk of rearming anybody when scientists tell us that another war definitely means total destruction of the world?

Mr. Culbertson: The alternative is: In the name of morality to submit to the domination of the most ruthless gang in the world — the communist world state.

Yes, we have a moral right, but in order to do that we must not resort to power politics. We must work first to establish a world law with a world judge, with a world policeman, and then if the judge appoints us as deputies we do have a moral right. We Americans are a nation of deputy sheriffs.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the other side of the house.

Lady: Mr. Lewis, why not go all out on an effort for world federation instead of wasting money and material on Maginot-minded rearmament in this atomic age?

Mr. Lewis: That's really Mr. Culbertson's field, but I'm perfectly agreeable to going ahead with world federation just as rapidly as is possible.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady over on the side?

Lady: My question is directed to Mr. Duranty. Won't helping rearm Western Europe save the other European countries from the plight of Czechoslovakia?

Mr. Duranty: I don't think so, because the Atlantic Pact will save other European countries from the plight of Czechoslovakia. I say it is not a question of the danger of war. So much of this debate has been founded on the question of what will happen if war comes. I say there will not be a war and that the best way to strengthen Europe is not to give it either very new weapons or some rather outworn weapons, but help its economic progress and self-development. After all, the European countries don't want a totalitarian system. Of course not—not even Czechoslovakia. But when they get into an economic mess they very often listen to false and unwise counsels.

Mr. Denny: All right, thank you. The young lady here.

Lady: Mr. Culbertson, suppose

that instead of joining the rest of the world, the communist government will attack and overrun Europe?

Mr. Culbertson: If we have proper organization of the world, give an ultimatum to the communist government, and, instead of agreeing to disarmament, they attack us, then we must finish with them now before their atomic bombs are completed with them, rather than wait supinely like cattle for several years later and have them finish with us then.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Question over here?

Man: I have a question for Congressman Blatnik. You spoke of using new and better ideas in place of Teddy Roosevelt's "Big Stick." Just what would these be?

Congressman Blatnik: The development of Western Europe on a sound economic basis, to carry out, in effect, Point Four so very well expressed by President Truman in his state of the union message.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you, Congressman Blatnik. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's discussion, here is a message of interest to you.

Announcer: While our speakers prepare their summaries, here are some more questions and answers about our Round the World Town Meeting.

Q: Why don't you include Ireland in your trip? I am sure you

subscriptions would mount if you do.

A: There are 76 nations in the world and we could only visit a limited number on this trip. We hope this will be the first of many. You may be sure that our moderator, of Irish ancestry, will see that Ireland is not neglected.

Q: What countries will you visit this summer?

A: According to present plans, the first Round the World Town Meeting will originate in the following cities: London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Rome, Ankara, Cairo, Tel Aviv, Karachi, New Delhi, Manila, Tokyo, Honolulu and Washington.

Q: Will these programs be broadcast in these countries as well as the United States?

A: That is entirely optional with each country and depends a good deal upon the methods of translation we use. However, our Town Meeting staff will volunteer to assist in the production of local Town Meetings wherever this is desired. Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: We'll hear first from Congressman Blatnik in Washington.

Congressman Blatnik: Mr. Duranty and I opposed the arms for Europe argument for these reasons:

1. The program if enacted will destroy our chances to realize the Fair Deal at home.

2. It will undermine European recovery.

3. Political ideas cannot be suppressed by force. This armament plan is an unworkable substitute for an economic program of social justice and human welfare and economic development and progress — the only solution to the threat of Communism.

4. European rearmament will encourage an arms race, weaken the United Nations, and lead to eventual war.

Mr. Duranty and I do not believe war is inevitable. We do believe that the Big Four discussions now pending offer us another chance for peace and one world.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman. Now, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Lewis: I believe that if we spend a relatively moderate sum now in making Western Europe strong we shall probably prevent Soviet Russia from plunging the world into war in the mistaken idea that the Red Army could occupy Western Europe practically without risk. But if Soviet Russia, having been stopped in the economic and ideological front, should then decide later to march anyway, it is still vital to us that our friends be as strong as we can help make them. This is a plan to prevent war if possible and to make victory more certain if war should come.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Now, Walter Duranty.

Mr. Duranty: My basic objection

to helping Europe to rearm is that it will take away money that would be better spent in putting Europe on its economic feet. It would further encourage the Europeans to spend more money on armament than they can afford.

I believe Russia does not want war and cannot afford war, and that Russia now knows, from the Atlantic Pact, that any military aggression would lead to war. But I think Europe's danger does not come from military aggression.

I've tried to show this and to show that the Marshall Plan with its civil and financial aid saved Europe in a far more critical time than now much better than any guns or tanks could have done.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Walter Duranty. A final word now from Ely Culbertson.

Mr. Culbertson: I think our opponents, Congressman Blatnik and Mr. Duranty have made out as good a case as they possibly could with an inherently weak cause. (Laughter.) But the whole question is, even if there is one chance in ten that Soviet Russia will not wage war at any future time, and even if there be one chance in ten that Soviet Russia will not have atomic bombs for many years, we cannot take that chance, because the stakes are the generations of Americans and of the world. We must do neither appeasement nor preventive war. The next step after the Atlantic Pact is to establish a strong world order. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Ely Culbertson, Walter Duranty, Mr. Lewis, Congressman Blatnik. Our warm thanks and congratulations to the Women's Institute of Duluth, Station WDSM, and our local sponsor, Freimuth and Company.

Tonight, I'm glad to announce the names of five of the 20 national organizations to be represented by their leaders on our World Town Hall seminar which is to accompany our Round the World Town Meeting this summer.

The National Education Association, whose membership is composed of most of America's teachers, principals, and superintendents, will be represented by Dr. Willard E. Givens, its executive secretary.

The Foreign Policy Association will be represented by its president, Dr. Brooks Emeny.

The American Association of University Women will be represented by its president, Dear Althea K. Hottle of the University of Pennsylvania. The National League of Women Voters will be represented by its president, Miss Anna Lord Strauss.

As you know, we are preparing an attractive scroll containing the names of the people, schools, and organizations contributing their dollars for democracy to make possible this Round the World Town Meeting. This scroll is to be presented to the mayors of the world capitals we visit.

I'm happy to tell you that the United States Conference c

Mayors will be officially represented in this group of 20 leaders. The Conference of Mayors has invited its past president, the honorable George H. Welsh, Mayor of Grand Rapids, Michigan, and former Lieutenant Governor of that state, to speak for the mayors of America. We hope that Mayor Welsh will be able to present greetings to the mayors of the various world capitals in the names of thousands of individuals and groups who will have supported the Round the World Town Meeting with their Dollars for Democracy.

The director of the Round the World Town Hall Seminar, and general manager of our Round the World Town Meeting, is Mr. Ches-

ter S. Williams, who is now on leave of absence from the United States Mission to the United Nations.

Next week we return home to Town Hall in New York City where our subject will be "Should Minority Groups Exercise Censorship Over Books and Films?" Our speakers will be John Mason Brown, author and lecturer; Morris L. Ernst, author and attorney of New York; Henry Epstein, former Solicitor General of the State of New York; and Father Robert J. O'Donnell, professor of philosophy at Iona College.

So listen next week and every week at the sound of the crier's bell.

Concerning Town Hall

WHEN NEXT YOU COME TO NEW YORK
. VISIT FAMOUS TOWN HALL



This internationally known sign hangs in front of one of the landmarks of New York—a handsome Georgian-style building designed by the great architectural firm of McKim, Mead, and White. Half a block from Times Square, heart of the theater district, Town Hall is within walking distance of most leading hotels and shops. All subways are near by and taxi drivers need only to be told, "Town Hall!"



AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING—now regularly on Television (as well as Radio)—originates from Town Hall on Tuesday nights throughout the winter season. (During the sunny half of the year, as many of you know, it travels the length and breadth of the United States.) Tickets to Broadcast-Telecasts are free. Stop in, or better still, write in advance.



MUSIC—More musical events are held annually in Town Hall than in any other concert hall in the world. Such musical greats as Lotte Lehmann, Yehudi and Hepzibah Menuhin, Maria Anderson, Aksel Schiotz, and Nelson Eddy have made their American recital debuts here. When planning a trip to New York, write for the monthly Calendar of Events.



LECTURES—Town Hall's world-famous Morning Lectures now in their 55th season, run from November through April. Leaders of thought and opinion are heard Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays at 11. Although sold by subscription months in advance, a few single admissions are almost always available.

**FOR INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR VISIT TO NEW YORK, WRITE: PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR, TOWN HALL
NEW YORK 18, N. Y. — LUXEMBURG 2-2424**